

Remarks

In the present RCE, claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

I. Examiner Interview

Patent attorney Philip Lyren thanks Examiner Amin and Supervisory Examiner Zimmerman for having a telephone interview on December 19, 2006. The claims are amended in accordance with that interview.

II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,701,306 (Kronmiller) in view of US application number 2002/0118202 (Baldwin). This rejection is traversed.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143. For at least the following reasons, Applicants assert that the rejection does not satisfy these criteria.

The independent claims recite numerous recitations that are not taught or even suggested in Kronmiller in view of Baldwin. By way of example, amended claim 1 recites the following (emphasis added):

designating a **same single** edge for each border tile;

determining whether the **single** designated edge of each border tile crosses the polygon, is within the polygon, or is outside the polygon in order to determine a spatial relationship between the designated edge of each border tile and the polygon; and

generating the attributes of the border tiles based on whether **only the single** designated edge of each border tile crosses the polygon, is within the polygon, or is outside the polygon.

On page 5 of the Final OA, the Examiner rejects the claim recitation “designating at least one edge for the border tile and determining a spatial relationship ...” and argues Figs. 21 and 22 of Kronmiller. Specifically, on page 5 at paragraph 10, the Examiner states “designating at least one edge is interpreted as designating **all** the edges of the tiles; Fig. 22 shows a polygon and a rectangular tile where **all the four sides** of the rectangle correspond to the designated edges of the tiles” (emphasis added).

In contrast to Kronmiller and statements of the Examiner, claim 1 is amended to recite “designating a same single edge” (emphasis added). The claim then recites generating the attributes based on “whether only the single designated edge of each border tile crosses the polygon, is within the polygon, or is outside the polygon” (emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, the independent claims are allowable over Kronmiller and Baldwin.

III. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Kronmiller and Baldwin in view of JP 410240952 (Nishihara). This rejection is traversed. As discussed above in section II, Kronmiller and Baldwin fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Nishihara does not cure the deficiencies of Kronmiller and Baldwin. Thus, for at least the reasons provided in section II, claim 13 is allowable over Kronmiller, Baldwin, and Nishihara.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529